

Remarks

The Applicants have amended Claim 1 to remove “piece of a” from line 2. The Applicants have also amended the last line of Claim 1 to include the additional characterization of angle α as being greater than or equal to 45° . Support may be found throughout the Applicants’ Specification such as in paragraph [0046]. Entry of the above changes to Claim 1 into the official file is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-2, 4-7 and 7-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as failing to comply with the written description requirement and being indefinite. The Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner’s detailed comments concerning the “a piece of a guide roll” language in line 2. As noted above, the Applicants have removed “piece of a” from Claim 1. The Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the rejection is now moot. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Swanke. The Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner’s detailed comments applying Swanke against those claims. The Applicants respectfully submit, however, that Swanke fails to implicitly or explicitly disclose all of the subject matter of Claims 1 and 2.

The Applicants respectfully submit that Swanke fails to explicitly or implicitly disclose that angle α is greater than or equal to 45° . In that regard, the Applicants note in the rejection the reference to angle α being equal to 0° . This is clearly not greater than or equal to 45° as claimed. Withdrawal of the rejection is accordingly respectfully requested.

Claims 4-5 and 7-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over the combination of Swanke with Nojiri. The Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner’s detailed comments applying that combination against those claims. The Applicants respectfully submit that the combination would fail to disclose, teach or suggest the subject matter of those claims. The Applicants also respectfully submit that the combination would also fail to disclose, teach or suggest the subject matter of Claims 1 and 2. Further, the Applicants respectfully submit that Swanke taken alone and/or Nojiri taken alone fail to disclose, teach or suggest the subject matter of Claims 1 and 2. Details follow.

Swanke discloses the following: “Referring to FIGS. 1 and 3, gimbal axis 95 is perpendicular to and intersects longitudinal axis 23 at the midpoint of roller 24 and lies in the entrance plane defined by intersecting lines of action 92. As noted previously, the plane of entering portion 10 is parallel to the entrance plane,” in col. 8, lines 10-15. Swanke explains that an incident

angle between the gimbal axis 95 is discernable from the figures and the entrance plane of entering web portion 10 is parallel to each other. In other words, there is no other variation than $\alpha=0^\circ$ in Swanke, especially in the structure seen in Figs. 1-4 that the Examiner particularly notes.

The Applicants enclose a Fig. 1 that shows the motion mechanism of the structure in Claim 1 in which $\alpha \geq 45^\circ$ is prerequisite.

In the Applicants' yarn path guide, when the distance between guide roll 2 and upstream guide roll 10 of the yarn path guide is L (the length of the yarn path), an amount to be corrected (=variation of a yarn path position) is $x = L \cdot \sin \alpha \cdot \sin \theta$ (θ is the roll inclination angle).

For a variation x of the yarn path position, the distance L between guide roll 2 and upstream guide roll 10 of the yarn path guide is sufficiently large (x is usually on the order of "millimeter" and L is usually on the order of "meter") and, accordingly, only by a little roll inclination, can the effect of a sufficient correction of the yarn path be obtained. This effect is remarkably shown particularly when α is equal to 45° or larger (namely when a value of $\sin \alpha$ is large).

In sharp contrast, in Swanke, where there is no other variation than $\alpha=0^\circ$, it does not allow the working of an operation that corrects the yarn path (in the case of Swanke, web traveling direction) by rotating a roller around the gimbal axis 95 as in Claim 1 and, accordingly, it is anything but obvious that the claimed subject matter could or would be achieved by one skilled in the art over Swanke alone or in view of Nojiri.

Furthermore, in Swanke, although there is a castering axis 90 that can have an effect of changing the web traveling direction and it is deemed that a rotation around the castering axis 90 is likely to contribute to equalization of tension in the web-width direction, whereby an opposing action works to such an action that corrects the yarn path (the web traveling direction in Swanke) in the Applicants' Claim 1 and in this regard, Swanke is fundamentally different from the Applicants' structure.

The Applicants therefore respectfully submit that given the inapplicability of the combination of Swanke with Nojiri with respect to Claims 1 and 2, the Applicants respectfully submit that the combination is further inapplicable to Claims 4-5 and 7-8. Withdrawal of the rejection is accordingly respectfully requested.

In light of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that the entire application is now in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



T. Daniel Christenbury
Reg. No. 31,750
Attorney for Applicants

TDC/brm
(215) 656-3381